

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 4, 5, 34, 39, 41 and 44 have been amended and previously withdrawn claims 6-33, 35-38, 42 and 45 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been entered. Therefore, claims are pending and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 34, 41 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Iwaki. Claims 34 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Leonard et al. These rejections are overcome.

Regarding the rejections of claims 1, 4, 5, 34, 41 and 44, it is noted that these claims have been amended to recite, "a protrusion group having a plurality of protrusions each protruding therefrom and toward the disk so as to generate a sinusoidal air pressure profile having an initially increasing and then decreasing amplitude in the outward radial direction of the disk on the surface of the disk." Calling attention to the phrase, "so as to generate a sinusoidal air pressure profile having an initially increasing and then decreasing amplitude in the outward radial direction of the disk on the surface of the disk," applicants note that this subject matter has been incorporated into these claims from claim 46 which has been identified as being allowable. Thus, since it is believed that it is specifically this subject matter that renders claim 46 allowable, its incorporation into claims 1, 4, 5, 34, 41 and 44 renders these claims allowable as well. Thus, it is believed that the rejections of these claims are overcome.

Regarding the rejection of claim 2, it is noted that claim 2 is allowable due at least to its dependence upon claim 1, which is allowable as discussed above. Thus, the rejection of claim 2 is believed to be overcome.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leonard et al. in view of Morikawa (JP 04-159676). However, it is noted that claim 40 is allowable due at least to its dependence upon claim 34 as discussed above. Thus, it is believed that the rejection of claim 40 is overcome.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:

Claim 39 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims as suggested. Thus, it is respectfully requested that claim 39 be formally allowed.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited. Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 12/9/05

By: 
Howard I. Levy
Registration No. 55,378

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510